



FEB 07 2002

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

William R. Evans
LADAS & PERRY
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023

In re Application of	:	
LAZAREV, et al.	:	
U.S. Application No. 09/485,329	:	DECISION ON PETITION
PCT No.: PCT/RU98/00251	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)
Int. Filing Date: 03 August 1998	:	
Priority Date: 11 August 1997	:	
Attorney Docket No.: U 012599-9	:	
For: DICHROIC POLARIZER	:	

This decision is in response to "RESPONSE TO DECISION ON PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)" which is being treated as a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) filed 24 August 2001. In a decision dated 24 May 2001, the "RENEWED PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)" filed 01 December 2000 was dismissed because applicant did not provide adequate proof that joint inventors, Alexandr Alexandrovich Miroshin, Nicolai Vladimirovich Malimonenko and Sergei Vasilievich Belyaev, refused to execute the application or could not be reached after diligent effort and applicant did not provide a statement of the last known address of the non-signing inventors.

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by (1) the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(h), (2) factual proof that the missing joint inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) a statement of the last known address of the missing inventor, and (4) an oath or declaration by each 37 CFR 1.47(a) applicant on his or her own behalf and behalf of the non-signing joint inventor. The 07 November 2000 decision indicated that petitioner has satisfied items (1) and (4) above.

Regarding item (2) above, Section 409.03(d) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.), **Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**, states, in part:

Where inability to find or reach a nonsigning inventor "after diligent effort" is the reason for filing under 37 CFR 1.47, an affidavit or declaration of facts should be submitted that fully describes the exact facts which are relied on to establish that a diligent effort was made.

The fact that a nonsigning inventor is on vacation or out of town and is therefore temporarily unavailable to sign the declaration is not an acceptable reason for filing under 37 CFR 1.47. Such a petition will be

dismissed as inappropriate.

The affidavit or declaration of facts must be signed, where at all possible, by a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts recited therein. Statements based on hearsay will not normally be accepted. Copies of documentary evidence such as certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instructions, telegrams, etc., that support a finding that the nonsigning inventor could not be found or reached should be made part of the affidavit or declaration. It is important that the affidavit or declaration contain statements of fact as opposed to conclusions.

"Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of its refusal must be specified in an affidavit or declaration by the person to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Before a refusal can be alleged, it must be demonstrated that a *bona fide* attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature.

When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the affidavit or declaration. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the affidavit or declaration.

When it is concluded by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which the conclusion is based should be stated in an affidavit or declaration. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the affidavit or declaration, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the affidavit or declaration.

a. Inventor Sergei Vasilievich Belyaev

As to Item (2), a review of the present petition and the accompanying papers reveal that applicant has satisfied item (2), in that the applicant has shown that a *bona fide* attempt was made to present the application papers, including the specification, claims, and drawings to Sergei Vasilievich Belyaev. The steps taken are sufficient to show that missing inventor Belyaev refuses to execute the application.

b. Inventors Alexandr Alexandrovich Miroshin and Nicolai Vladimirovich Malimonenko

The petition does not include sufficient factual proof that joint inventor Alexandr

Alexandrovich Miroshin and NicolaiVladimirovich Malimonenko refused to execute the application. The "Declaration" of Alla Y. Sakharova fails to provide documentary evidence to support a showing that the two inventors were presented with a copy of the complete application nor the susequent refusal by joint inventor Alexandre Alexandrovich Miroshin and NicolaiVladimirovich Malimonenko. Additionally, the "Declaration" of Alla Y. Sakharova infers that Alexandre Alexandrovich Miroshin and NicolaiVladimirovich Malimonenko are refusing to execute application based on Mr. Belyaev emails. In that Sergei Vasilievich Belyaev does not appear to be the attorney for the inventors, any such statement would not constitute a refusal by the inventors.

Regarding item (3) above, petitioner has provided a clear statement of the last known address of the non-signing inventors.

For the reasons stated above, it would not be appropriate to accept the application without the signatures of Alexandre Alexandrovich Miroshin and NicolaiVladimirovich Malimonenko under 37 CFR 1.47(a) at this time.

CONCLUSION

The renewed petition under 37 CAR 1.47(a) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTH** from the mail date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CAR 1.47(a)." No additional petition fee is required.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Box PCT., Washington, D.C. 20231, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention to the PCT. Legal Office.



Richard Cole
PCT. Legal Examiner
PCT. Legal Office



Anthony Smith
Attorney-Advisor
PCT. Legal Office
Tel.: 703-308-6314
Facsimile: 703-308-6459